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Abstract: The present article explores the triad theory-practice-political for psychoanalysis portraying contradictions, misusages and paradoxes, which derive from it. The discussion of the political as a feature embedded within the field is articulated and problematized. Through the Lacanian notion of subversion, this essay examines Lacan’s position on May ’68 and metapsychological implications for the field of such discussion. Focusing on what a psychoanalysis for the post-humanity era would look like, this critical appreciation of the political and Lacanian subversiveness, tensions the ethical of the field itself.
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Psychoanalysis and its knots:
The construction of psychoanalysis as a field has always faced many challenges and most of these challenges seem to be structurally embedded in its core. One can easily find questions of science, practice, dissemination, methodology, boundaries (or its lack of)… So, it is not such a bold statement to say that psychoanalysis was forged through struggles. In this sense, it should come as no surprise or provoke awe into no one, address the divisiveness of psychoanalysis. The polemic history of the psychoanalytic field concerning politics or even, about the problematic tacit internalization of the political through the institutional aspect on the construction of the field - those are challenging elements since Freud started formalizing the field. Therefore, none of these remarks are necessarily new, it is actually quite the opposite, they were always already invisibly and silently making themselves present. Freud,1 establishment of psychoanalysis as a field has always stumbled upon challenges regarding the triad of the theoretical, clinical and political.

This is one of the many heritages Freud left to psychoanalysis, but this is a quite particular one, this is a ghostly heritage. This challenging triad lurks through the field and haunts any one who steps into it. And as good ghost stories usually goes, the moment of ‘scare’ comes when the unexpected comes to surface, even if only retroactively as a surprise - what appears was always already there, hidden in plain sight. Dolar2 makes this point remarkably clear, Freud’s lack of political positioning, marked the foundations of the psychoanalytic field with this absence.3 The ‘ghostly’ sightings produced by the knotting between these three notions,

1 Freud 1989/2014
2 See Dolar 2008
3 Danto 2005, p. 63
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or to put into other words, the proper effects of this lack of the political within psychoanalysis have only recently started to be seriously explored. Considering this premise, the present article attempts to examine some authors that have already dealt with this 'ghost' before and also, takes into consideration a few notions that derive from it. And, not 'setting the score' with the political history, will always lead to creating the ghosts that will haunt the fields of knowledge.

The French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan is quintessential for the proper examination of this challenging triad. Lacan⁴ provided a much needed attention to the political through his psychoanalytic developments, but still not a necessarily satisfying one, many questions are still left open. Although his investigation of Freud’s psychoanalysis did provide great tools to further investigate this blindspot of the field, the psychoanalyst himself was a bit ambiguous on some of his political positions. And, after approximately forty years of Lacan’s death, his theoretical developments still resonate lively within many different realms of thought, but to what concerns psychoanalysis - the ghost of the political seems to keeps on haunting the field. It is not so far fetched to consider that Lacan felt the effects of this ghostly blind spot on his own skin. One should only consider how Lacan’s excommunication from the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) seems to exemplify, to a great extent, an effect of that. Lacan was theoretically and clinically courageous, but this institutional and political step was rather forced upon him. Maybe the creation of the Freudian School of Paris [L’Ecole Freudienne de Paris (EFP)] could be considered an institutional materialization of an impasse derived from this triad.

Lacan’s return to Freud⁵ and the establishment of his own psychoanalytic thinking was divisive from its beginning. And aspects of this divisiveness will be approached throughout this article, not in a historically dedicated manner but in a specific theoretical way. Considering this, a few decisions were already made and translated here through the framework chose for this text. These decisions are the following: (1) a reflexion between philosophy and psychoanalysis is viable (but not without considering its consequences) and (2) the standpoint of Lacanian psychoanalysis is being investigated and not refused. Therefore, this article does not aim at delegitimize Lacanian psychoanalysis, but to specifically approach and explore it. The key element to be considered regarding our ‘ghostly’ triad is the Lacanian understanding of subversion and its divisive consequences.

_____

⁵ See Lacan 1996

Lacanian thought and the ghost of the political:
This first stop might be considered a bit of a common place, but it is a necessary one. For psychoanalysis, the articulation between other fields was somehow always already there. Freud from the beginning of his formalization had invited literature, science, philosophy, as well as other fields. Although concerned with invention, his approach to other fields of thought was rather strategic and focused on defending what psychoanalysis was not. Much like trying to explain what a circle is by defending that it is not a square. This particular Freudian heritage was immensely embraced by psychoanalysts, but its consequences are not always fully appropriated. Basically, it is common to notice psychoanalysis placing itself as a particular discursive position, finding itself quite comfortable as a field to examine and address all other realms of knowledge, but usually forgetting that other fields could provide crucial insights to psychoanalysis.

The second stop made here, regards how Lacan took Freud’s invitation of articulating psychoanalysis with other fields and boosted into much larger potency. Lacanian psychoanalysis is remarkably concerned with providing proper metapsychological grounds⁶ to the field in order to better sustain the clinical practice. So, the approximations with other fields explored by Lacanian psychoanalysis was ‘internally’ provoked and therefore justified by clinical challenges and theoretical impasses. This approach logically generates internal consequences, but the external subsequences to this very own movement of approximation were usually not cross-checked. With that being said, one understands Lacan’s “uncanny”⁷ formal approach to other fields, traces unfamiliar/familiar bridges, since these were always already there. Acting as if psychoanalysis could smoothly bridge between different fields, because blurrifies the lines between the internal and the external, as a paradoxical feature printed in its “dna” allowing it to come and go as it pleases. Although Lacan was worried with the internal impasses of psychoanalysis, formally speaking, this critical rigor could be formidably valid if further explored, specially by psychoanalysis. And once again, this is most definitely not a denial of Lacanian psychoanalysis in terms of the validity of its structure and practice - this is only the tensioning of some historical impasses of its theory regarding our current conditions.

Another crucial heritage concerning our discussion is the silence, the peculiar silence of the political within this triad (theory-practice-political). Kept hidden under broad daylight, this silent link of psychoanalysis, its political link, make itself present in many different situations - but far mostly for its absence, in its brutal silence, its lack.
The political in psychoanalysis acts like an anamorphic element, it is simultaneously invisible and all-too-present at the same time. For instance, when theory and practice are "pushed against the wall", is the ideological shadowplay of its elements that quietly present itself. Sometimes the reasoning behind a few of the formal and theoretical choices done in psychoanalysis are vastly ideological. So, it is incontrovertible that the political should be regarded when discussing psychoanalysis - especially, because it is an open element at its very own kernel. Thus, the consequence of this open element at the center of psychoanalysis is one of the key points of decisiveness within Lacanian theory. And along with ideological decisions, there will be implications and consequences. Such elements must be considered when thinking the current psychoanalytic scene. This is where ideological implications appear more clearly or where this decisiveness more obviously arises. But this apparent decisiveness is still problematic, because it only tells half of the story. When Freud approach psychoanalysis to the a scientific Weltanschauung⁸, a scientific like perspective towards disagreements and developments was defended. Disagreements in the theoretical field, even metapsychological ones, should be addressed theoretically within the field and not avoided politically/institutionally. The usual defense of psychoanalysis in order to keep up with its theoretical and practice orthodoxy is to use the weight of the institution, e.g. IPA versus Lacan,⁹ because the author propose to think the field beyond the institutionally programmed agenda. This is why a critique of ideology seems rather necessary to address the field - psychoanalysis as a field should most definitely not place itself ‘above’ it or free from it, as some psychoanalysts would like to think.

From the Freudian formalization of psychoanalysis and then to Lacanian developments of the field, the political has always found a way to provoke the thinkers. Lacan did pushed psychoanalysis to have a more open dialogue with its own problematic political kernel, but this point is much more ambiguous than it seems. The French author was most definitely not a militant revolutionary, even less was Freud for that matter. Although their combined efforts in psychoanalysis, managed to built formidable tools to thought itself and also, to the critical analysis of social transformations. To a certain extent both thinkers dealt with the political scenario of their historical realities in their theoretical developments and both provided insights to the external political situations (e.g. Freud on the World War⁹ and Lacan¹⁰ on May of 1968) but still, their wits was not necessarily translated into the institutional level of their own field.¹²

I ideological choices produce deep implications. How one approaches Lacanian psychoanalysis (or any other theory for that matter) should be put to understood through such axiom, in order to attest for the knowledge produced from it. Thus, choices within knowledge production matter and they must come from the object.¹³ And psychoanalysis, in this sense, works in the same way, in a non-totalizing sense. For instance, when Stavrakakis¹⁴ discusses if Lacan should be considered either a reformist or a revolutionary, forcing a dichotomic approach which induces a false discussion. On a previous article called The dead master, the placed master: another shielding of orphanage,¹⁵ a detailed examination on Lacan’s rather ambiguous relationship to the political, takes a closer look at his position on May ’68 and provides a valid critique to Stavrakakis’ render on Lacan. The two main critical points from this article are: (1) by placing Lacan as an “a” or “b” kind of theorist the author misses out on the crucial dialectical aspect of his materialist theory: its notion of excess¹⁶ and (2) reading Lacan as either a reformist or a revolutionary, do not do justice to the paradoxical subtlety and potency of the Lacanian formulation of subversion. The term is addressed in nine different passages throughout his book¹⁷ and yet, the type of investment needed to support “the radical democratic ethics of the political”¹⁸ remains to the author as a question mark. Well, the subversive viability of seizing the means of symbolic production, is a much needed type of investment towards current class struggle, a much formidable insight for proper radical politics. No questions asked.

But, this is jumping ahead, one must go back to Lacan in order to present how his political position is much more ambiguous than some authors (and some psychoanalysts) would like to think.¹⁹ For example, when Lacan famously stated:

If you had had a bit of patience and if you really wanted our Impromptus to continue I would tell you that the revolutionary

¹² Danto 2005
¹³ Milner 1996
¹⁴ Stavrakakis 2007
¹⁵ Gonsalves & Estevão 2018
¹⁶ Milner 1996
¹⁷ Stavrakakis 2007
¹⁸ Ibid., p.282
¹⁹ Gonsalves & Estevão 2018
aspiration has only one possible way of ending, only one: always with the discourse of the Master, as experience has already shown. What you aspire to as revolutionaries is a Master. You shall have one!\

At a first glance, one could read Lacan’s interaction with the students, as some crude reactionary position or perhaps a proto-reformist approach. But remember ambiguity is key, here. Lacan’s position was that the structures were walking the streets, when he place such statement there is a crucial psychoanalytic insight being placed at stake. By the way, after fifty years one could risk saying that its a political insight still hard to be listen. As further explain on another opportunity, psychoanalysis requires conditions for its existence and must struggle against what resists to its existence. So when Lacan, prescribes hysteron of the Master, as experience has already shown. As an effort to voice this silent link and provide grounds for psychoanalysis to think contemporary suffering, Lacan is aware of the implications of articulating symptoms through Marx and Freud. Thus, after Lacan and Althusser’s explosion of Freudo-Marxism, psychoanalytic theory permitted itself through subversion to think critically about capital and also, emancipatory possibilities. Probably the reason why there are tons of texts produced in this direction after Lacan. A lot of proper names such as Jacques Rancière, Slavoj Žižek, Alenka Zupančič, Mladen Dolar, Barbara Cassin, as well as others... which to certain extent embrace the subversive viability of psychoanalysis in order to provide a valid critique to the contradictions of our reality. Therefore, Lacanian psychoanalysis renders forms of sociability and politics, especially concerning his theory of discourses. And another suitable argumentation, comes from the Lacanians trying to make sense if Lacan was a conservative or not. A rather homologous line of questioning one find on Marxists, more than necessarily on Marx himself. Lacan’s subversiveness speaks for itself. When Lacanian psychoanalysis, sustains its subversive function despite all efforts to ‘normalize’ it or to try to turn it into another mastery discourse - this is what is at stake and what should be consider. The defense of he analytical discourse as subversive, and the defense for the conditions for that discourse to always continue to be subversive, is where psychoanalysis should find its militancy. And psychoanalysts a large missing piece of their praxis.

Orthodox psychoanalysis hits again when the choice to read Lacan only through the configuration of the five discourses he did formalize and that forgets that Lacan himself was open to the formalization of other ones, has an ideological push. Other discursive possibilities are viable, especially one that aims at emancipatory politics and subversive conditions to current contradictions. So, for those who defend psychoanalysis must not be political, these are not naive but ill intended. Perhaps even cynicals, sustaining through their choices to privilege a given reality instead of fully embracing the subversive element that lies at the core of psychoanalysis itself.

Miller and the political: silent choices

If taking sides is crucial for psychoanalysis, it is necessary noticing how it shapes different coordinates for Lacanians and moreover, if there is someone who truly understand this is Jacques Alain-Miller (later on addressed as JAM). Well, in a sense JAM had to face major institutional challenges inside psychoanalysis which are analogous to Jung’s. And institutionally, with associations and schools, he did progressed the Lacanian dissemination worldwide. And theoretically, at a tremendously young age he wrote fundamental essays for psychoanalysis and later on held the responsibility of establishing Lacan’s Seminars. But concerning our topic of choices and political repercussions, one must consider Pavón-Cuéllar’s critical take on the paradoxical position of Jacques Alain-Miller to “fight” neofascism while supporting neoliberalism. Although a more in-depth understanding on the heritage from Cahiers pour l’Analyse still needs to be formulated, a whole new article would be necessary to even start to address the recent rampage of Miller against his old fellows Badiou and Rancière. But is safe to say that, it traces back to the political spectrum of psychoanalysis and its implications. On one hand, one must not ‘throw the baby out with the bathwater’ considering meaningful articulations and dissemination from Miller to the field; but on another hand, the recent events do invoke much needed attention concerning the political within psychoanalysis. So, bringing one of
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Cuellar’s prescription:

The surprising thing is that it was a psychoanalyst who refused to listen with the greatest attention to the symptomatic neofascist denunciation of neoliberal capitalism. Like most of his compatriots, JAM preferred to erase the symptom than to attack the disease. Instead of facing neoliberal capitalism and positioning itself as abstentionist or voter against Macron, JAM and millions of French, in fact, only tried to stifle the telling neofascist symptom by voting against Le Pen. And they succeeded: they took a painkiller, a sedative that will take away the neofascist discomfort for five years, but what will happen in 2022?

Well, neofascism and neoliberalism go more hand in hand, as effects of capitalism than are just mere ‘stumbles’ of such system. And Cuellar defends the point that JAM, as well as other psychoanalysts, did not fully capture what Lacan pointed out about Marx through ’68 to ’70:


to grasp quantitatively the object of desire, to surplus-enjoyment, through the calculation of surplus-value understood as surplus of the use value of labor over its exchange value. But Marx’s calculation allowed him to approach the notion of surplus-enjoyment by isolating what cannot be reduced to calculation, which goes beyond surplus-value, what is lost by the worker, as well as non-transferable, unexplored, unusable for the capitalist. This useless is what manifests itself in the generalized un Happyness in Marx’s capitalism, as well as in the malaise of Freud’s culture, and it is also in the name of what we can condemn the typically bourgeois ideological reduction of desire to the supreme principle of utility, as is manifested in JAM and Laurent.

Obviously, the point here is not to condemn a much necessary stand against neofascism, but to contextualize it and to problematize Miller’s particular silence regarding other political situations. Thus, something of Milner’s understanding of a Lacanian materialism seems necessary to criticize this much defended principle of utility embraced by JAM and other psychoanalysts. The servile obedience to the current Millerian politics, without critical consideration can only sustain the suffering produced by capitalism and its contradictions. And even further, such dissemination risks turning psychoanalysis itself into a kind of hermeneutics of the elites. Therefore, some ethico-political priorities are required for nowadays Lacanians. The JAM from the crucial problems of psychoanalysis and who questioned Lacan about the ethical statute of the unconscious instead of the Heideggerian ontic, is no more. Lacan’s understanding of ethics for psychoanalysis and its metapsychological implications, should be heard under the subversive potency of the field which is a political one, as well.

Clinical psychoanalysis must be able to assimilate contemporary suffering. And it is unlikely sustain psychoanalysis subversive potency in the era of “post-humanity” without taking into consideration its political kernel. Beyond only aiming at the reach of psychoanalysis for those who suffer, psychoanalysis must be able to absorb and speak to popular suffering. A psychoanalysis which problematizes suffering whose expression itself is money. A psychoanalysis dialectically aware of subversion, understands that the capitalist discourse does not connect subjects to other subjects, but subjects to the objects of their libidinal enjoyment and must be able to deal with suffering caused and expressed by it. The metapsychological insights derived from this parallax, still needs to be further explored and developed, but such coordinates are crucial for clinical psychoanalysis nowadays. Such perspective not only provides fundamental clinical insights, but also, allows for a valid analysis of the conjunctions and disjunctions regarding labor and militancy faced by political movements and social movements. A psychoanalysis that faces its political kernel, must confronts its impasses regarding the economy logics, providing steps for a political transformation about how the subjects spend their time. The notion of subversion allows a shift of realms, it makes room for the displacements of fields and also to the introduction of a void or of a completely different universality, therefore setting the ground for the ‘transcultural’ link of common struggle between different communities.

Subversion in psychoanalysis

Lenin stated that “[i]t is precisely because Marxism is not a lifeless dogma, not a completed, ready-made, immutable doctrine, but a living guide to action, that it was bound to reflect the astonishingly abrupt change in the conditions of social life”. Lenin’s approach to Marx can be parallel to Lacan’s approach to the Freudian wissenschaft. When Freud approach psychoanalysis to a scientific weltanschauung (roughly translated as world-view), in his classic, he sets a non-totalizing science to encompass the field. Many challenges derived from this
metapsychological configuration arise, on one hand a non-totalizing logic was sketched, on another hand, the ambiguity towards the political got structurally placed. These profound consequences are bound to Freud’s choices when establishing psychoanalysis.

The non-totalizing wissenschaft of psychoanalysis proposed by Freud, when formalizing the tools to investigate the unconscious setted all sorts of troubles that resonates even today. Lacan’s return to Freud had to deal with some of those choices and the ambiguity with the political, this more symptomatic formation also played its part. If psychoanalysis always had a privileged sit judge external political situation, it seems to almost always struggle to deal with its own political issues. And Lacan tried to formalize his response through the notion of subversion as a living guide to action, acting as a constant reminder that psychoanalysis is not a “lifeless dogma, not a completed, ready-made, immutable doctrine”.

Lacan’s notion of this excess, from that which is never fully symbolically subsumed, therefore non-totalizing, an insight that in some sense guides Milner’s understanding of Lacan as a materialist. And Milner defends that the main characteristic of an authentic materialism resides on the fact that it is not totalizing, derived from a systematic need. Milner describes this feature as an incompleteness and through it, the author approaches Marx to Lacan defending a non-totalizing reading of psychoanalysis. Milner picks up this instance, presenting the double inscription of this lack, sustaining a possibility for shift the narcissistic coordinates. And for Freud, the present provides a temporal subjective experience of the plane tend and which at the same time belongs to all and never lies in them. It is not the science-ideal, which “incarnates” in a variable way the scientific ideal: strictly imaginary determination, demanded in order that representations are possible.

Milner explains this metapsychological disjunction-conjunction between the ideal of science with the science ideal, conforming to the disjunction-conjunction of the Ideal of the I to the I-ideal. And even further, the author defends that: “From this structural analogy we shall easily extract the effects of the mirage which operates the name science, they exist, must be dissipated, but science is not reduced to this.” So, Lacan sustains Freud’s aphorisms regarding science as a technique, but differentiates himself in terms of the ideal of science for psychoanalysis. Milner concludes that searching for the conditions where psychoanalysis would be a science and to present a totalized constructed scientific model for psychoanalysis to follow are the two faces of the same false approach. And without an ideal of science nor a science-ideal for for psychoanalysis, the field “must find in itself the foundations of its principles and methods.” It is the element of analysis which became the ideal point as an epistemological and clinical coordinator, Lacan even defends the notion of praxis to describe the Lacanian orientation of analysis. To build the ideal of analysis for science, from within psychoanalysis. Milner reminds that such movement inspired the marxists of the Cahiers pour l’analyse, to find within Marxism itself its coordinates for praxis.

Psychoanalysis viability its praxis by letting go of an external ideal for itself and aiming at a possibility from within. This line of thought could be articulated with Canguilhem’s critique of normativity, where he defends how life is always already present at any moment of subjectivization, therefore artificial gestures of cutting will never be without consequences. And in this sense, any attempt at fully boxing psychoanalysis to moral, biological or scientific normativities, will miss psychoanalysis itself. Thus, the discursivity of psychoanalysis must be subsersive at its kernel. On a clinical level, subjectivization is rather crucial for psychoanalysis. It deals with the narcissistic fiction of the I, established by the Freudian disentanglement of the ideal of I and I-ideal, portraying subsequent qualities of neurotic suffering. Both fictions express the past and the future constantly experienced by the subject.

And for Freud, the present provides a temporal subjective experience of lack, sustaining a possibility for shift the narcissistic coordinates. And Lacan picks up this instance, presenting the double inscription of this
fiction to the subject. For example, when the psychoanalyst pedagogically
formalizes the schema $R$,\textsuperscript{40} those are the vectors he uses to present the
'field of reality':

![Figure 1: schema $r$ (Lacan 1991)](image)

Lacan's complexification of the schema $L$, formalizes the relation
between the Imaginary and the Symbolic, but also differentiates Real and
reality for the subject. This double inscription is much more complex and
promotes all kinds of challenges for clinical psychoanalysis regarding the
subjective experience, which were further explored by Lacan through the
logic of the knots.\textsuperscript{41} Fundamentally, the role of fantasy is always already
infiltrated in the reality believed by the subject. And if the ethical purpose
of psychoanalysis regards the awakening from the fantasy that control us
when awake\textsuperscript{42} then, the role of subversion seems only necessary. Lacan's
subversiveness can be dialectically revolutionary, although Lacan was no
revolutionare and even a stand to surpass capitalism through subversion
can be drawn from his teachings. But the political within psychoanalysis
must be faced instead of being a recurrent repetitive symptom of itself
and its consequences heard as loud as possible, instead of silenced.

**Ideal of Communism or communism-Ideal?**

Benefiting from the discussion made so far and learning from Milner's
insight, let's extrapolate and propose a thought experiment: what
would be to consider the ideal of communism and communism-Ideal?
Considering what was already discussed until now, such short-circuit
not only provides an interesting render of the historical experiments
tried this far, it also provides insights to political challenges found even
today. According with Žižek\textsuperscript{43} the proper subversive re-significance of
communism, is only justified if references the excluded. All antagonisms
miss its subversive edge if the excluded are not in sight. And logically
following Milner's argumentation, this must not be a pathway towards
another ideal or to another dead guide, but a appreciation of specific
political knots - all with the same level of importance and intimately
connected - which triggers the living guide of political action. Or in
other words, these are thoughts in order to thinking reactions to today's
contradictions. The disjunction-conjunction of this double inscription
on the political level, tactically means to (1) consider a subversive
tearing up of the zombified symbolic fabric of reality, (2) sustaining
the void provoked by it and (3) also, provide conditions to invent a new
affirmation of the impossibilities. The first and second elements are
defended throughout the article, under the name of subversion. The
radical possibility of subversiveness within Lacan's proposition, provides
the tools for seizing the means of symbolic production and fighting the
zombified fabric of reality.\textsuperscript{44} And concerning the last point, one must
consider it as the tie knot of some arguments which will be further
presented in brief conversation proposed between three proper names:
Žižek, Mbembe and Badiou.

Žižek compares contemporary riots and outbursts (e.g. Ferguson,
USA) with May '68 arguing its lack of a guiding fiction.\textsuperscript{45} This does not
mean that their struggle is not justified, it means that it expresses a
paradoxical condition: the systematic violence imposed upon the Black
communities and all the frustration experienced by them, explodes to
the surface through acts of violence. The silent violence that sustains
reality, normalizing brutality and exploitation leads to this lack of trust on
ideals. And even worst, it undermines hope for something new. Political
frustration is always first felt, it comes as an affect. Such outbursts
solidify the contradictions of social disparities harming and putting in
danger even further those who already suffered enough. It generates
more violence towards those who already experience too much of it, as
the author defends. Heading back to the main discussion, Žižek criticizes
the Kantian understanding of "communism as a regulative idea and
thereby resuscitating the spectre of 'ethical socialism', with equality as
its a priori norm or axiom."\textsuperscript{46} And the Slovenian thinker goes further:

Rather, one should maintain the precise reference to a set of
social antagonisms which generates the need for communism;
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the good old Marxian notion of communism not as an ideal, but as a movement which reacts to actual contradictions. To treat communism as an eternal idea implies that the situation which generates it is no less eternal, that the antagonism to which communism reacts will always be here. From which it is only one step to a deconstructive reading of communism as a dream of presence, of abolishing all alienating representation; a dream which thrives on its own impossibility.47

Always from the standpoint of the excluded, the need for communism comes as a movement of reaction to social contradictions. It means to demand the impossible, to put the contradictions sustained by reality in check and aims at enlarge reality transforming it. This is the living guide of action which tears up the zombified fabric of reality, that pushes it towards new universalities. Marx is the link between Mbembe and Žižek, and Badiou will basically tell us how. In Mbembe’s *Critique of Black Reason*48 the neocolonialist thinker, philosophically portrays the “Becoming Black of the world.”49 as the new condition of existence in our reality. This means that the neocolonial domination and exploitation is globally spreaded, a point already warned by Marx and Engels50 and explored by Fisher,51 Badiou,52 Dolar,53 as well as many other thinkers; the consequence of this vastly spreaded capitalism, is the need of a "bridge" between cultures and identities, gathered in a common struggle against a common condition of suffering. This is what thinking in circulation or thinking-crossing54 means for Mbembe, the possibility of a link that transcends identitarianism in the name of a common struggle.

And finally, there is Badiou’s understanding of the ‘generic’ linking through Marx, the previous arguments from Mbembe and Žižek. The French thinker argues that:

"...Marx gives the name 'generic humanity' to humanity in the movement of its self-emancipation, and that 'proletariat' - the name 'proletariat' - is the name of the possibility of generic humanity in its affirmative form. 'Generic', for Marx, names the becoming of the universality of human being, and the historical function of the proletariat is to deliver us this generic form of the human being. So in Marx the political truth is situated on the side of genericity, and never on the side of particularity. Formally, it is a question of desire, creation or invention, and not a matter of law, necessity or conversation... So for Cohen - as well as for Marx - the pure universality of multiplicity, of sets, is not to be sought on the side of correct definition of clear description but on the side of nonconstructibility. The truth of sets is generic."55

Thus, Badiou’s comprehends that revolutionary desire lies within the realisation of generic humanity, which represents the end of the separation between law and desire, and claims for the "creative affirmation of humanity as such."56 Defending the necessary creative engagement for seizing the means of the symbolic fabric of our reality, supporting the law of life, in order to create a new symbolic fiction. Perhaps, this is what a psychoanalysis in an era of ‘post-humanity’ should ethically pay attention to. In this sense, perhaps this is the parallel to be consider. This is where the current coordinates of suffering are displayed, and a field which focus on diminishing symptoms and a traversing of the fantasy, must be able to address it. The constant subversiveness of psychoanalysis guides the analysis by re-inventing the coordinates for the subject by the subject, towards a cure. While the constant movement within communism sustained by the local engagement, reacting against the contradictions of reality and demanding what is impossible, also subverts the given conditions in the name of a new Universality.
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